



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

andern, etc.—On P. 108, l. 16, *in welchem treue Seele lebt*, since there is no reference made to the omission of the indefinite article, this may be supposed to be a misprint for *eine treue Seele*, as it stands in the former edition.—Slight errors in the references are: 24, 17 for 23, 17 (note to 31, 22); 4, 27 for 4, 29 (note to 62, 1).

In the preface the statement is made that "Undine is generally read early in the course." What is to be understood by "early" is rather indefinite, and the word was doubtless intended to be taken *cum grano salis*; but it seems to be sound doctrine to emphasize that 'Undine' should scarcely be taken up before the class has read some of the classics of average difficulty. FOUQUÉ's style, the conception of the characters, the action and development in 'Undine,' are such as to afford a profitable exercise in style and literature for the more mature student.

H. SCHMIDT-WARTENBERG.

University of Deseret.

PARASITIC *i* IN OLD FRENCH AND PROVENÇAL.

Die Quellen des parasitischen i im altfranzösischen von E. WALDNER. Freiburger Diss. Braunschweig, Westermann, 1887, pp. 40.

Das parasitische i im Alt- und Neuprovenzalischen von H. SABERSKY. Freiburger Diss. Berlin, Mayer und Müller, 1888, pp. 47.

The former of the above-mentioned dissertations presents a praiseworthy and exhaustive investigation into the sources of the so-called parasitic *i*, i. e., "dasjenige *i*, das sich bei der Umbildung des Lateinischen zum Französischen aus einer, sei es primären, sei es sekundär entstandenen palatalen Konsonanz entwickelt hat, und mit dem benachbarten Vokal zum Diphthong verschmolzen ist. Das parasitische *i* kann an den der Konsonanz unmittelbar vorausgehenden oder an den ihr unmittelbar folgenden Vokal herangetreten sein, oder es kann sich auch beiden Vokalen je ein solches *i* zugesellt haben, z. B. PACAS: *paies*, CARUM: *chier*, PACARE: *pai-ier*."

Accordingly the author makes two broad divisions of his subject: *a*, where the parasitic *i* is joined to the preceding vowel; *b*, where it

is joined to the following vowel. *A* is again subdivided into two chapters, I, parasitic *i*=intervocalic *c, g, j*; II, parasitic *i* developed from a compound palatal consonant.

SABERSKY follows closely the same general plan and manner of arrangement as WALDNER; but the dissertation before us is only part of a work entitled 'Zur provenzalischen Lautlehre (parasitisches *i* und die damit zusammenhängenden Erscheinungen),' which he promises to publish ere long.

In the case of parasitic *i*=intervocalic *c, g, j*, we have to do with a process of assimilation of palatal *c, g* to the surrounding vowels (*c>g>j>i*); velar *c, g* falls without trace (SECURUM > *seur*). The series *precas: preies: prieis: pries* (p. 7) is misleading, *prieis* being no doubt a misprint for *prieies*. That WALDNER's explanation (p. 8) of *-ūca>ue* (with simple falling of *c*) is correct, is proved by VERRUCA > Prov. *berrugo*, etc. (SABERSKY, p. 15). SCHWAN, 'Grammatik des Altfranzösischen,' § 36,4, supposes a change of suffix *-uca>-uta*. Why is VAGINA > *ga-ine* said to be irregular? The word has developed as FAGINAM > *faine*, SAGIMEN > *sain*, REGINAM > *reine*; the *y* coming from *ġ* has united with the *ī* that followed (cf. HORNING, 'La Langue et la littérature françaises,' § 144, b; SCHWAN, 'Gram.' § 173). Before *ē* it formed with *ei* the triphthong *iei*, which was reduced to *i*; SAGENA > *seine*, PAGENSIS > *pa-ieis* > *païs*. For the last-mentioned word this pronunciation is demanded by grammarians as late as MAIGRET (cf. THUROT, 'De la prononciation française' i, p. 501). The contamination of *a* by the parasitic *i* must here have taken place at a much later period.

The second chapter treats of the parasitic *i* developed from a group of consonants, in which one element was *c, g, j* or *ġ*. It was THOMSEN, "L'*i* parasite et les consonnes mouillées en français," *Mém. d. l. soc. d. ling. d. Paris*, iii, pp. 106-123, who first applied to French the principle formulated by SIEVERS, *Verhandlungen der 28. Versammlung deutscher Philologen*, Leipzig, 1873, p. 190 (and later, 'Grundzüge der Phonetik,' § 23 and p. 238): "Kein Vokal kann über einen oder mehrere Konsonanten direct einen Einfluss auf einen anderen ausüben, sondern stets ist

der Konsonant der Vermittler." THOMSEN still considered as exceptions to the law [vowel] + [palatal+mute, or mute+palatal, or mute+ǰ] + [vowel] > [vowel] + [palatalized consonant] + [vowel] > [vowel, i] + [consonant] + [vowel], the labials and sometimes *n* and *r*. NEUMANN, 'Zur Laut und Flexionslehre des Altfranzösischen,' Heilbronn, 1878, p. 23 ff., generalized the law, so as to make it include labials as well. The task before both WALDNER and SABERSKY was, therefore, not to discover any new principle, but by a systematic and methodical arrangement of the subject to show the workings of this well recognized law. This has been admirably done; however, it is only to be expected, that, when a subject so full of unexplained forms and mooted questions is treated in a summary way, statements should appear that do not meet all objections. Of such a nature is the explanation (p. 14) of *duite*, *truite*, *luite* by the side of *doit*, *troite*, *loitier* from DŪCTUM, DŪCTUM; LŪCTA, LŪCTA; TRŪCTA, TRŪCTA respectively. FÖRSTER *Z. f. r. Ph.* iii, p. 498, had supposed *Umlaut*, but this explanation was not accepted by NEUMANN, *Z. f. r. Ph.* viii, p. 243 ff., who took as his authority MARX, 'Hülfsbüchlein für die Aussprache der lateinischen Vokale,' Berlin, 1883, where *u* is marked long in both LŪCTA TRŪCTA. In a second edition of the same work, Berlin, 1889, MARX changes LŪCTA to LŪCTA, still leaving DUCTUM with *ū* and TRUCTA with *ū*, because it derives from Gr. τροχον-τῆς. Leaving *truite** out of the question, we have side by side, in O. Fr., *doit* and *duit*, *luite* and *loitier*. A similar case is presented in the appearance of *o*+*i* as *-oil* and *-uil*; cf. *genuill*, 'Roland' 2923; *genuil*, *Q. L. D. R.* 322, 6; *genoilhes*, 'Dial. Greg.' 184, 3; *genoil*, 'Cliges' 6487. Now it is a well known fact that in a certain part of the O. Fr. territory *o* could be represented by both *o* and *u* (cf. G. PARIS, 'Alexis,' p. 58 ff.), and in the same way *o*+*i* by *oi* and *ui*; cf. MALL, 'Computus' pp. 41 ff., 60 ff. The pronunciation of both was *ui* and the pronunciation of *genuilz*, if the *i* was sounded at all, was *genuilz*. It stands in *u* (*o*) assonance, 'Rol.' 2192 (*genuilz*: *suls*:

*The latest fascicule of GODEFROY to which I have access (No. 57) ends with *raillon*, and the word is not found in BURGUY. BARTSCH, 'Chrest.' gives *trute*. LITTRÉ cites *truite* from the 13th century.

baruns). So *VOCEM* occurs as *voiz* and *vuiz*, *CRUCEM* as *croiz* and *cruiz*. Applying this principle to DUCTUM, it appears from GODEFROY, s. v. *doit*, that *duit* is found in 'Brandan,' 'Q. L. D. R.,' GARNIER'S 'Vie de St. Thomas,' by the side of *duit*, O. Ps.; *doit* in the other dialects. *Loitier* from LŪCTARE is regular; LUCTA occurs in O. Fr. as *luite*, *lute*. The latter of these, from BERNARD (BURGUY ii, p. 381) is a learned form; *luite* is the common form, representing Latin LŪCTA. GODEFROY does not mention the word, and *loitie*, BURGUY s. v., is given without reference. One might be tempted to regard *loitie* as a verbal noun from *loitier*; *luite* rhymes with words in *üi*, cf. *anuite*: *luite*, BARTSCH, 'Lang. et Lit.' p. 201, l. 5. In view of these facts it seems doubtful whether MARX'S change of LŪCTA>LŪCTA was an improvement; cf. also, GRÖBER, WÖLFFLINS *Archiv* iii, p. 516.

Esmeraude (p. 15) is not to be looked upon as coming from SMERALDUM "mit Suffixvertauschung," but it must be explained as It. *salma* from Gr. σάλμα. The Greek *γ* was understood by the Latin ear as *u* (=t); cf. SEELMANN, 'Aussprache des Lateins,' p. 349. —In *conissant*, *apparissant* (p. 17) with *i* for regular *oi*, it is not necessary to see "Suffixvertauschung nach Analogie derjenigen Participia Präs. in denen die Endung *-issant* auf *-iscentem* zurückgeht." The reason that **crissant* is never found for *croissant* lies in the fact that in *croissant* the initial syllable bears a secondary accent, while in *conissant*, the second syllable is unaccented. A case in point is *travillies* 'Miserere' 263, 4, 'Aniel,' 409, *orgillous* 'Carité,' 36, 8. For the same reason, **villans* is never found by the side of *vaillans*. The same explanation applies to *orison*, *venison*, *rovison*, *comparison* (p. 35), *ochison* (p. 37); cf. also MUSSAFIA, *Z. f. r. Ph.* i, p. 409; NEUMANN 'Laut- und Flexionslehre,' p. 53.

MACREM>*maigre*, ACREM>*aigre*, HALĖCREM>*haligre* are explained as "Fremdwörter, welche schon früh aufgenommen wurden, und deshalb noch insoweit der französischen Lautentwicklung nachkamen, als sie wohl paras. *i* entwickelten, aber die Gruppe *cr* nicht mehr zu *r* reduzierten, sondern bloss zu *gr* abschwächten." But this does not meet the

difficulties at all. "Mots savants" cannot be said to go through a certain phonetic development quicker in order to overtake, as it were, other words of the same nature that have advanced beyond them in their development. They at once come under the influence of those laws that held sway at the time of their adoption into the language. But even granting an exceptional case of rapid development for the words in question, the forms still remain unexplained. A parasitic *i* could develop from *cr* if we accept SCHUCHARDT'S view, only when *c* > *χ* > *j* had reached the stage *j*, or, adopting the theory of THOMSEN, only when *r* had become mouillated (= *r̃*). Now neither of these changes can be applied here. If *i* in *maigre* is the same parasitic *i* that is seen in *faire*, *g* is not explained; if *c* changed to *g*, how is the *i* to be accounted for. Why is there no *i* in *sogre*? The same questions might be asked regarding *avogle*, *jogleor*, *siegle*, *beugler*, by the side of *aigle*, *aiglent*. In view of these considerations the explanation of MEYER-LÜBKE, 'Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen' i, p. 198, acquires a strong degree of probability. According to this scholar, *ai* in *maigre*, *aigre*, *aigle* was not a diphthong, but *ε*: ACRUM changed to *ēgru*, PADREM > *pēdre*, LABRUM > *lēbru*; *pēdre* became *pere*, but *mēgre* kept the consonant, and accordingly did not change *ε* > *e*.—*Anceisor* (p. 20) is perhaps best regarded, with KARSTEN, 'Zur Geschichte der altfranzösischen Konsonantenverbindungen,' p. 69, as a secondary formation upon *anceis*.

When WALDNER takes the pronunciation of *vowel* + *ī* final, and medial between vowels, everywhere except in the dialects of the East of France (parts of Picardy and Champagne, Lorraine, Franche-Comté, Burgundy), to be *vowel* + *ī*, i. e., without parasitic *i*, he is in the main correct. However, the rule as such is too broad and calls for important limitations; but as it is my intention to publish shortly a study of dialectic peculiarities in the history of *ī*, I may refrain from entering here on a discussion of these points. The fact is, that in no other chapter of Old French phonetics are dialectic differences of greater importance than in this one. I can not however altogether agree with our author when he says (p. 24): "Folgt

ein Konsonant unmittelbar auf *ī*, so geht die Mouillierung verloren, das paras. *i* bleibt aber erhalten (*esveilt*).... Dieser Fall tritt auch ein, wenn ein flexivisches *s* sich an die vorhin aufgezählten Substantiva mit auslautendem *ī* anhängt: *soleiltz*, etc." But words with *ε* + *ī* are infelicitous examples to choose; because *ī* did not hinder the diphthongization of *ε* > *ei* any more than it did that of *o* > *ue* (*ueil*) or *ε* > *ie* (*viel*). Therefore we find *vermeille* 'Rol.', 985 in *ei*-assonanz, and *soleiltz* comes about from analogy with the uninflected form. The true nature of the case is more evident from words in *-alz* (*-ailz*). Here it appears plainly that *-alz* is the older form, cf. *amiralz* 'Rol.' (23 times), *amirailz* (5 times); *travalz* 'O. Ps.' (6 times), *travailz* (once). *ī* + the flexional sign becomes in O. Fr. *-lz* or *-ls* according to the dialect, and if an *i* is written before the *l*, it was introduced from analogy with the uninflected forms; and where the *i* was not pronounced in these, it also fails to appear in the inflected forms; (cf. 'P. Mor.' *conseil* 75c, *conselhe* 130b, both pronounced *conseī*, *conselz* 155b). *Conseilt*—*conselt*, *esmerveilt*—*esmervaut* are dialectic forms, the former Norman, the latter Picard; cf. *esmervaut* 'Mis.' 88, 1. Thus it appears that, as *travail* + *s* was *travalz*, *mélius*, according to strict phonetic law, would have become *melz* or *mels* and *VECLUS *velz* or *vels*. *Melz* is actually found 'Eul.' 16; 'Pass.' 27, 151; MS. L. of 'Alexis' 4b, 4e, 97e, and 'Contin. du Brut de Wace,' GODEFROY s. v., while *mels*, so far as I know, does not occur, though its existence at some time in the history of the language is proven by *meuls*, 'Destr. de Rome,' GODEFROY, s. v. But *melz* as such was unique in the language. The only word akin to it was *VECLUS > *velz* (cf. *velz* MS. L. of 'Al.' 2d); and here *ie* was early introduced by analogy with the uninflected form *viel*. Besides, in *veillece*, *veillard* and *meillur* the stem-syllables were felt to be substantially alike, and because *veillece* corresponded to *vielz*, *meillur* was given a corresponding form *mielz*. In orthography the analogy was carried still further; *vielz*, from analogy with *viel*, was written *vieiltz*, where the second *i* was certainly not pronounced, cf. *vieiltz*, 'Rol.' 2409, 2807 in *ie*-assonance, and in the same way *mielz*

(cf. *mielz*: *vielz*: *ie*, 'Rol.' 539) was changed to *mielz*, which occurs in 'Rol.' twice, by the side of *mielz*, 17 times. One would almost be tempted to see a further instance of analogy in *miel* ('Prise de Pamp.' 1086, GODEFROY s.v. *mielz*), unless we have to do here with a simple mistake of the copyist. From *mielz* the diphthong was carried into *mielldre*. The regular form would be *meldre*, which however had only a short existence, though it is occasionally met with; cf. 'Proteslaus' (Anglo-Norman) 2169, GODEFROY s. v. In Wallonian, on the other hand, where no difference was made between $\tilde{l}+s$ and $l+s$, *melz* may follow the analogy of words in -ELLUS as well as that of *VECLUS; cf. 'P. Mor.' *miez* 142d, *meaz* 277a, 'Dial. Greg.' *viez* 5, 14.

The remaining parts of WALDNER's treatise (*cj*, *tj*, *dj*, *bj*, *vj*, *pj*) have been most ably and fully discussed by MUSSAFIA in his "Osservazioni sulla fonologia francese," in the latest number of *Romania* (vol. xviii, p. 529 ff.).

JOHN E. MATZKE.

Bowdoin College.

An Old High German Primer, with Grammar, Notes and Glossary, by JOSEPH WRIGHT, Ph. D. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press. 1888. 12mo, pp. 170.

Until very recently the little scientific work that was done by Englishmen and Americans in the field of Germanic philology had to be accomplished through the medium of New High German text-books and treatises. It is surprising that up to the present time not a single standard grammar of either Middle High German or Old High German has appeared in English. To be sure, the advanced English or American student of Germanics must have a thorough knowledge of New High German and be able to read it as fluently as his mother tongue; but there is a place, in America at least, for English text-books on Germanic grammar.

In Gothic and Old English a beginning has been made in this country; in the case of Gothic, by BALG's English translation of BRAUNE's 'Gothische Grammatik,' and in the case of Old English, by COOK's edition of SIEVERS' 'Angelsächsische Grammatik.' The latter work is the only strictly scientific

grammar of a Germanic language that has yet appeared on this side of the Atlantic (unless we except MARCH's 'Anglo-Saxon Grammar,' which was of service in its day and generation) and is, let us hope, the earnest of valuable original work in the same direction. On the side of German, however, America has not even produced a translation of an Old High German or Middle High German grammar (excepting the unpublished M. H. G. outline Grammar and Reader of the late PROF. OTIS).

But one attempt, notably that of PROF. BRANDT, has been made here to present a historical treatise of New High German grammar. BRANDT's N. H. G. Grammar is indispensable to the American student who wishes to study N. H. German historically in his mother tongue. The state of things in England, as regards German at any rate, is with one or two exceptions worse than in America. These exceptions are DOUSE's 'Introduction to Gothic' (perhaps we should include DOUSE's 'Grimm's Law: a Study' and STRONG's English translation of PAUL's 'Principien'), and the book under review, DR. WRIGHT's 'Old High German Primer.' This is the second of a series by the same author, the first being his 'Middle High German Primer.' The O. H. G. Primer is a much more pretentious book than the M. H. G. Primer, which was too elementary to be of great service in American schools. The O. H. G. Primer combines grammar, reader, notes and glossary, and aims "to bring within a comparatively small compass all the really more important features of the language," so that the beginner may acquire "such a sound elementary knowledge of the language as will enable him to pursue his further study of German with little difficulty."

The outline of the grammar is drawn mainly from BRAUNE's 'Althochdeutsche Grammatik' (1886), and the text for reading from BRAUNE's 'Althochdeutsches Lesebuch' (edition of 1881). The general plan of the Primer is in the main good. It distributes the material as follows: Phonology, 35 pp.; Inflection, 45 pp.; Syntax, less than 3 pp. (!); Text 49 pp.; Notes, 6 pp.; Glossary, 30 pp. Let us consider these separately.

Phonology. This chapter contains much